

REMARKS

Claims 5 and 7 are currently pending in the instant application. Both of the pending claims have been amended by way of this Amendment. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A)

Claims 5-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heider, U.S. Patent No. 4,429,342 in view of Nagatani, U.S. Patent No. 4,905,985. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Heider teaches an armature 4 having a position sensing means 12, which is a photoelectric switch with a light beam that is interrupted by a guide portion 6 of the armature 4 (Fig. 5; and column 5, lines 5-9). When the armature 4 is placed in motion, a timer element 37 of an armature control means 36 begins operation. At the moment the armature 4 passes out the sensing path of the position sensor 12, a rectangular pulse is generated where a trailing edge thereof stops the timer element 37. This timer element 37 supplies a timer value to a comparative control means 40, which compares the determined time value with a predetermined time stored in a memory 38. "Emphasis added." Using this comparison, an excitation current to a coil 3 is controlled. Heider makes no reference to the prospect of using a flux valve in order to control the excitation current.

Nogatani teaches a cam operated gripper for a printing press. The Examiner has relied upon the Nagatani patent document to allege that switching gears are commonly used in the printing art. Although the Applicants do not necessarily agree with the propriety of the Examiner's obviousness rejection, it is nonetheless clear from review of the Nagatani patent document that the disclosure thereof fails to teach or suggest the use of a flux valve when affecting control of a coil.

Therefore, in view of that which is set forth in amended independent claim 5 and the foregoing arguments, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, and/or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone Timothy R. Wyckoff (Reg. No. 46,175) at (703) 390-3030 in the Washington D.C. area.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKY & PIERCE, P.L.C

By: _____

 #46,175
Donald J. Daley, Reg. No. 34,313

DJD/TRW:tljw

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 390-3030

VERSION OF MARKED-UP CLAIMS

5. (Thrice Amended) A solenoid system for switchgear, comprising:
an armature;

a yoke;

a coil interacting with the yoke to move the armature;

sensors detecting actual values of drive-specific switching parameters;

and

a control device of a switchgear drive, the control device being one of an open-loop control device and a closed-loop control device, wherein after a switching command, the control device does not affect an output quantity for controlling the coil until [at least one predefined] a flux threshold value of the actual values of the drive-specific switching parameters is attained, the output quantity being a coil current, the drive-specific switching parameters being variable during a switching operation [and including at least one of a contact speed and a flux].

7. (Twice Amended) The solenoid system according to claim 5, wherein the [at least one predefined] flux threshold value is settable.

Please cancel claim 6.